

COBBETT'S WEEKLY POLITICAL REGISTER.

VOL. 37.---No. 22.] LONDON, SATURDAY, DEC. 16, 1820. [Price, 6d.]

TO THE ELECTORS OF WESTMINSTER.

First, on the Trial in an action of Wright against Mr. Cobbett.
Second, on the late Westminster Meeting, and on the conduct of the Rump and the Members for the City on that occasion.

London, Dec. 13, 1820.

GENTLEMEN,

I have never liked to obtrude my private concerns upon the attention of the public ; but I have been compelled to do so more, perhaps, than any other man that ever lived. I say *compelled* ; because it is, in fact, compulsion when it becomes necessary, in order to prevent the weakening of the effect of my public exertions. How many times have my antagonists, of various descriptions, enjoyed their day or week's exultation at what they flattered themselves was my overthrow ! How often have they even said that they had *sunk* me for ever ! And how often have they been sorely disappointed. I do suppose that, speaking upon a moderate computation, more than twenty thousand bitter and malicious libels have been published

against me, while it is pretty notorious that I have had, at one and the same time, open enemies arrayed in tremendous powers, and pretended friends, carrying about in their bosoms little *ests* and *sloe-worms* to sting and annoy me. Yet I have passed through all this ; and I believe there is no spectator of the present political scene, who will regard me as much reduced in point of power. I have never appealed to the LAW to protect *me* against calumniators. I have relied upon truth and time and talent. The Rump do, I am told, exult exceedingly at having obtained a verdict on Monday last, the eleventh inst. against me in favour of *Wright*, with a THOUSAND POUNDS DAMAGES. They have now, they say, *sunk* me in good earnest ! Never was a man so often sunk ! This is no

Printed and published by W. BENBOW, 209, Strand.

sinking. This is what the sailors call merely "*shipping a sea*;" that is to say, taking a wave on board, which only gives the vessel a "*heel*," but by no means prevents her from keeping on her course; and, gentlemen, you will see that this, like every other "*sinking*" that I have experienced, will be at last a *mounting* in place of a *sinking*.

This trial has brought certain things to light; that is to say, has made them evident; has produced proof of their existence, of which existence we had before only conjecture and suspicion for our guides, or rather as the grounds of our conclusions. The matter of the trial itself, as well as the speeches of Mr. Scarlett; the conduct of the witnesses, and of the abettors and supporters of the thing altogether; these all demand some attention; and I beg leave to trouble you with some short observations with regard to them.

In the first place, with regard to the alleged libels themselves, I have only to repeat here what I stated during the trial, namely, that *here the thing cannot drop*. I shall by and bye speak more fully upon what Mr. Scarlett said with re-

gard to my wish to *shift the responsibility* from my own shoulders to those of my eldest son, and I shall also speak upon the foulness of his imputations with regard to that son, who, upon his own oath, tendered himself as a *defendant*. I shall offer no conjecture here as to the reasons which induced Mr. Scarlett, and that client who is so well worthy of him, and of whom he is so well worthy, to be so extremely pertinacious in wishing to have *me*, and *me only*, for a defendant. I declared, and I declared the truth, that I was neither printer, publisher, nor proprietor of any one of the articles for which I was sued; and, in my view of the matter, the evidence fully bore out this declaration.

Now, gentlemen, observe that, there were three Registers the first published in January 1817; the second in March 1819, and the third in January 1820. With regard to the first, I would not swear that I did not write the article, but I should be full as reluctant to swear that I did; with regard to the second, which puts forward Wright by *name*, points out his place of abode, and imputes to him certain specific crimes, I

wrote no part of that which constituted what is called the libel. With regard to the third, it merely calls *Wright* the tool of the Rump, and is no more a libel than any part of the Liturgy is a libel. Part of it was dictated by me to my son John. He said he thought the whole of it was; and I do not know whether it was or was not.

It is the second of the three, to which I wish to draw your attention. I sent home to my Son William an article entitled "*Crown and Anchor Farce*;" and a farce it certainly was. At the exhibition of that farce, it came out that this *Wright* was the man who had communicated to *Cleary* a private letter of mine to read on the hustings at Covent-garden. In commenting upon the farce, I alluded to this communicator of the letter; but I entered into no particulars with regard to him, and I neither named him nor pointed out his place of abode. If you will look into the Register here alluded to, you will find pretty satisfactory proof of this fact; for in one part of it I say that I will "take another opportunity" of shewing who and what this man is. But this manuscript by no means satisfied my Sons or their

Mother, who were boiling with impatience to have something done of a more direct nature. My sons, therefore, put their pens to work, and produced that which has, at length, led to this judicial proceeding.

This is the true state of the case. The motives to do the thing, and the doing of the thing also were fairly, and with a scrupulous regard to truth, stated by my Sons in their evidence. It was also truly stated by my son William, that he acted wholly for himself and for his own benefit, during my absence; that is to say, after he himself arrived in England from America. He truly stated, that it was left entirely to himself, either to publish or not to publish any thing that I might send him. Whatever I sent or might send, he was to consider as his own; to be altered, amended, or wholly rejected, according to his own judgment and taste. And observe, that the evidence that was produced to shew the contrary of this, was a letter from me to my faithful *Jackson*, who had been recommended to me by *Lord Cochrane*, as a man in whose hands I might trust my life; the evidence was a letter (another private letter!)

from me to this man, saying that my Son (who was then going home) would take charge of *all my affairs* in England, and especially those of a *literary nature*. What evidence was this? *Jackson* was then the publisher; and this was merely telling him that he was to be so no longer. However, it was concluded that my Son published under my directions, and that I was responsible for whatever he did!

Dolby, indeed, swore that he heard me say, after I came home, that all that *I had written* about *Wright* was true. Bear in mind that *Dolby* had been sued by *Wright* at the time when I came home; that he was preparing to justify; that I had the books and other documents; that it was very natural for me to say that *I would prove the truth of what had been published*; but was it natural for me to say (even if the thing had been so), that *I myself had written the thing*? *Dolby* swore, that I said I would prove the truth of what *I had written* about *Wright*. *Dolby* being asked, whether I had said, that it was *I* who had written the article in question, said, "no; but, if you had said the contrary, it would have

"excited astonishment in every one present."

This was the evidence. This evidence of *Dolby* and of *Jackson* was the only evidence to prove, that *I had caused the publication*. I shall, by and by, speak of the law of the case in this respect, but, I must first explain the real facts a little more fully.

The article consists of three or four facts loosely stated, without dates and without precise sums being named. Now, observe, *I had all the books and other documents with me*. I, therefore, if I had written the article myself, had all the means of making a grand array of particulars, and I leave you to guess whether I was likely to have forborne to do this. When the action was commenced against *Dolby*; or, at least, when it was coming on for trial, it was necessary for my son William to make affidavit that the proofs were with me, and that he expected me home before December. Such was the truth; and I arrived at Liverpool the latter end of November, bringing the books and documents with me; and there I was at the Angel Inn in the Strand, with the other

gentlemen who were witnesses in the case, at the time when the action against *Dolby* was coming on in December last; but, when we were all prepared, *Wright* suddenly *withdrew the Record*, and then commenced his action against *me*, instead of commencing it, as he ought to have done, against my son who alone had employed *Dolby* who had never had any communication with me in the course of his life, but who had been paid by my son to be the publisher of the *Register*, for my son, and not for me! *Dolby* had written me a letter to America; but I had not even answered that letter.

From these facts, which are all indisputable, it must clearly appear to every man that I did not even write the statement with respect to *Wright*, for, as I said before, if I who had all the books and documents with me, had written the statement, it is manifest that I should have gone into particulars of dates and sums, which my sons were unable to do for the want of those documents. You must needs think that my desire was strong enough to do the thing well; and having all the documents in my hands, and

plenty of leisure for the performance, it is impossible that I should have missed the opportunity. Besides, can it be supposed possible that, if I had really written the thing, which I must have known would be published in *February*, or *early in March*, 1819; can it be supposed possible that I, knowing that I myself could not come home until the *fall* of that year; can it be supposed possible that I could have sent home such an article to be published, and to be published *by my own Son*, too (for as to *Dolby*, I well knew that he would not make himself responsible); can it be supposed possible, I say, that I should have sent home such an article to be published by my own Son *without at the same time sending the books and documents*; which are spoken of, too, in this very article? Is it possible that, after having for so many years refrained from saying any thing at all about this man, notwithstanding so many provocations; once more I ask you is it possible that, under all these circumstances I could have written the article and sent it for publication, and still have retained in my own hands these books and

documents, though there never was one week passed without there being a ship coming from New York to England! You will say that it is impossible, and will conclude, that I had no more to do with the matter than any of you.

There is another fact, which is, I think, conclusive. The article talks of *big drops of sweat*, on a *cold winter's day*, rolling down *Wright's* forehead. Now, the transaction alluded to took place in the *summer*. I, who had the papers with me, *know the time*, and should, of course, not have made use of this little *colouring*. If I had stated *time*, I should have stated the right time; or, at any rate, should not have put *winter* instead of *summer*.

But, it is asked why I did not *now* justify and go into the whole justification. I was not aware of the forms of proceeding. To prepare, arrange and have every thing in order in that regular and scrupulous manner which the law, very wisely, requires, demanded a great deal more time than I had to bestow. The Coventry election almost immediately succeeded the bringing of the action; at the time when I might have

been making due preparations, *her Majesty arrived*. Her's was a *cause* of a vast deal more importance than mine; and as you may have heard, perhaps, I have taken some little part in that cause. At any rate, the fact is, that I never did, and never would bestow an hour nor even five minutes upon this thing. I knew that I was neither writer, printer nor publisher; and I was not to be persuaded that any jury was to be made to believe that I was either; and even if they were, I was determined to run that risk rather than enter into a justification upon this loose publication, destitute as it was, of all the particulars necessary to bring the matter fully and fairly before the public.

But, now Mr. *Scarlett*, *Wright* and the *Rump* will be furnished with a *real defendant*. I said that the matter could not stop here. *Wright* has now become a *public character*, he is now proved to have been in connection with the *Rump*. He is now seen furnishing them with the means, which (as *Adams* swore) were made use of in order to *counteract my attacks on Sir Francis Burdett*! It was a long time pretended; it

was pretended in print over and over again by *Cleary*, that he read the letter in REVENGE for Mr. *Hunt's* having read a letter of his; but now we have it upon the oath of *Adams*, over and over again, that the *Rump* got the letter from *Wright*, and gave it to *Cleary* to be read upon the hustings; for what! Why, because I had attacked Sir Francis Burdett; and in order to shew my inconsistency! And while *Adams* swore this, he smiled so sweetly upon Sir Francis, who had been summoned, as I suppose, as one of the witnesses for *Wright*, and who sat by the side of Mr. *Brougham* just opposite the witness box. Away then with the story about my letter being read by *Cleary* in revenge for Mr. *Hunt's* having read a letter of this hero of the white charger. Here we have it proved, that *Cleary* was the mere instrument in the hands of the *Rump*, and that the main object was to take vengeance on me for what are called my "attacks" on Sir Francis Burdett!

Wright, therefore, is, as I said before, a public character in Westminster. He belongs, in some measure, to that celebrated

body; that nice little snug corporation, which has been kind enough to take upon itself the office of regulating the political concerns of the City of Westminster; and especially that part of its concerns which relates to the choosing of members to represent that City in Parliament. This being the situation of *Wright*; being so closely connected with this Corporation, my son will, doubtless, think himself bound, as speedily as convenience will permit, to do justice to this celebrated personage, from whom came the letter, or, rather, the part of the letter relating to Mr. *Hunt* and the lady. Besides, Mr. *Scarlett* has had the modesty to assert in open Court, that the connection between me and *Wright* began by *Wright's* lending me twenty pounds; and, as proof of this, the careful personage produced in Court a private letter more than twenty years old! He produced, I think, between four and five hundred private letters, some of them not more than three inches square! all carefully put into two books! What a careful personage! How regular in the preserving and arranging of papers! How fit

to be keeper of records to the *Rump!*

However, his no less worthy advocate and eulogist, Mr. Scarlett, having represented him as lending me *twenty pounds*; *Wright* having acknowledged, upon the trial of *Cleary*, that he, *Wright*, about a year ago, shewed a private letter of mine to Mr. *Brougham*; this same *Wright* having upon his oath declared that he gave the letter to the *Rump* to be made use of in order to counteract my writings against Sir Francis *Burdett*; the Baronet himself having been brought into Court upon this occasion; *Wright* being manifestly the source from which were drawn what were thought to be the means of annoying me and of giving pain to my family in my absence; the letter having been exhibited at *Brooks's in the Strand*, where it was to be seen, according to public advertisement; *Brooks's* in the Strand having been the house where was exhibited, or left to be shewn, the copy of a private letter from Sir Francis *Burdett* to me (the original of which I never got), purporting to be an answer to a private letter from me to Sir Francis, relating solely to pecuniary mat-

ters, and which answer contained an injurious misinterpretation of the meaning of my letter to Sir Francis: these things standing thus; *Wright* being thus closely connected and mixed up with all these matters and all these parties, it is right, it is fitting, it is just, it is absolutely necessary, that he be known in his real character, in order that from it you may judge correctly on the subject. Of himself he is little. As a proof of my having thought little about him or his actions, I never, for seven long years, after he ceased to be in my service, made even an allusion to him; though, on many occasions, most earnestly implored to do it. I heard that he was seen very frequently with Sir Francis *Burdett*, with Lord *Ersine*, with Mr. *Vansittart*, and even with Lord *Castlereagh*. I supposed that it might be (as I still suppose it was) about the printing of their speeches in parliamentary debates, or some such matter. At any rate, it was no business of mine, and I left those gentlemen to do as they liked. As to my private letters, if any one could read them, that man was unworthy of my notice, or, at least, his good opinion was a

thing which it was my duty to hold in contempt. But now, *Wright* assumes another place! He now stands surrounded and completely mixed up with the parties above mentioned. *They* are of some public importance; *they* put themselves forward in an ostensible manner. He *belongs to them*; with him all the above parties have taken the fraternal hug. Let me and mine undergo all the disadvantage to be expected from his enmity; and let all the above parties participate in the honour reflected upon them by his friendship.

Having now placed the main matter fairly before you, I shall next advert to some circumstances that transpired at the trial, and to some of the singular notions and doctrines put forth upon this occasion by Mr. Scarlett, having first, however, requested you to go back with me to the origin of these law suits.

You will be pleased to bear in mind that, as it now appears in evidence (for I have never yet seen the original letter myself), a private letter of mine was read by *Cleary* on the hustings of Covent Garden, at the election of 1818. I should say

a part of a private letter, for no one has sworn that the whole was read. A part only of it at any rate was published in the newspapers the next day. The former and the latter parts of it were left out. My name was put at the bottom, the date was put at the top, and the name of the person to whom it was addressed was *not mentioned*. The letter in this state (in print) reached me in America. I declared it to be a *forgery*; and I now declare it to have been, in that state, a *forgery*; because if you leave out a part of any written thing, you, in fact, *alter* the thing; it is *not the same thing*; it is a *counterfeit*, it is a *forgery*. Besides, in this case, and as far as relates to my declaration of the thing that came out to America, and was first published in London, all the circumstances which would have led to a recollection of the letter, were left out; so that I naturally regarded it as a *forgery*.

However, the imputation of *forgery* was nothing in such a case. It was the breach of *private confidence*, and the indescribable baseness towards *the lady*. Towards myself it was bad enough, and especially as

the circumstance of *distance of time* was kept out of view in the reading at the hustings. Several persons who heard the reading have declared to me that they have no idea of any *date* being mentioned. One gentleman told Mrs. Cobbett (who arrived in England soon after the letter had been read) that he had understood it to be a *letter from me to Cleary*. In the hubbub of the moment, perhaps the far greater part of the people so understood it, and as *Wright's name was not mentioned*, how was any body to understand it, as being a letter to any body but *Cleary*? I had *Wright* in the box, on the trial with *Cleary*. He swore that he was on the hustings at the time; but he would not swear that the *whole* of the letter was read, nor would he swear that *his own name was mentioned*! *Adams* was also at the hustings, and he would not swear that the *whole* of the letter was read; nor would he swear that *Wright's name* was mentioned. In fact, Gentlemen, it is as clear as day-light, that only a part of the letter was read; that *Wright's name* was not mentioned; that the *date of ten years before* was skipped over;

and that the immense multitude that stood before the hustings were led to believe that it was a letter that had *come to Cleary from me*; and that I was speaking of Mr. HUNT and his way of life, in terms of the strongest reprobation *in private*, while I was, *in public*, holding him forth as a man worthy of admiration, and in particular of the support of the Electors of Westminster.

This, therefore, was a most atrocious act towards me and towards Mr. Hunt; but what was it then, Gentlemen, with regard to the lady? She, at any rate, had *not* "*attacked Sir Francis Burdett*!" She had said nothing against him, and done nothing against him! She had not been guilty of the unpardonable sin in vengeance for which, private letters, ten years old, were to be raked up and promulgated. *Adams* said, upon his oath, on the trial with *Wright*, that he had not been acquainted with Mr. Hunt since the year 1808; but did he not know that Sir Francis Burdett had? I reminded *Adams* of a circumstance, which I thought would have brought to his recollection an instance of particularly intimacy with that gen-

tleman, even in 1816. It did not, but, at any rate, Sir Francis Burdett, himself, was upon a very intimate footing with *Mr. Hunt* from 1810 to 1815, this was five years out of the ten that had passed since the letter was written. He had been at *Mr. Hunt's* house for a fortnight or three weeks at a time. He had been out shooting with *Mr. Hunt*. In short, they had been very intimate. He knew the lady very well. He had very frequently been under the same roof with her; and after all this, the *Rump* Committee bring out a letter, written by me before I had ever seen the lady, and before, I believe, I had seen *Mr. Hunt* more than two or three times; and they publish a part of that letter, in which I, without sufficient time to deliberate, had alluded to that lady in a way in which no human being can suppose I ever would have alluded in any public document or speech.

Now, look at this transaction, then, as connected with the conduct of Sir Francis Burdett upon the occasion. He knew what pain the promulgation of this letter was calculated to give to the lady. He knew very well all the effects that this pro-

mulgation was calculated to produce. I by no means accuse him, and I never have, of having given even his assent to the reading of the letter. But, he who has complained so bitterly of breach of private confidence, in a case of his own, and, indeed, so justly; he that could then be so feelingly alive in his own case, ought to have had some feeling for the lady in this case. Granted that the deed was done, before he knew any thing about it. I sincerely believe that it was so; but ought he to have been silent upon the subject after the deed was done? Could he hear of this deed being done by the *Rump* and *Cleary* without shunning them as he would shun a pestilence? Could he endure to sit in a seat in Parliament obtained by such men and such means? Did he think it consistent with his honour still to lean on this despicable *Rump* for support, to ride in a car preceded by *Cleary* on a white charger, while a banner with the word "*purity*" upon it waved over his head? Remember, Gentlemen, that the Chief Justice declared the promulgation of this letter under such circumstances, to be an act *worthy of the severest reprobation*.

tion; and remember also, that, after the commission of this act Sir Franciss Burdett not only continued to receive the caresses of the *Rump*; but, at the Crown and Anchor farce in the succeeding November, he expressly exculpated the *Rump* and *Cleary* from all blame in the transaction, and even notified to the meeting from his own lips that a *fac-simile of the letter would be published*; thus doing all that lay in his power to circulate widely and to perpetuate the stigma upon that lady, under whose roof he had been received and entertained with hospitality and kindness!

Is it *my fault* if these things be revived? Is it my fault if that which never ought to have taken place was not speedily forgotten after it did take place? Oh! no! it is *Wright* and the *Rump*, and *Cleary* and *Jackson*, these are the workers up of the matter. I am here, as I have been all through the thing, purely upon the DEFENSIVE. The beginning was the promulgation of the letter. *Wright* gave the letter; the *Rump* received it and gave it to *Cleary*; and *Adams*, one of the *Rump*, now declares upon his oath, as

indeed *Wright* declared, too, that the motive for the publication of the letter was to counteract the effect of my "*attacks upon Sir Francis Burdett*." So that, to this we come at last, the lady's heart was to be wrung; she was to become the subject of scandal with every scandalous tongue in the kingdom; she who was innocent of all offence against Sir Francis Burdett, was to suffer this in order to get vengeance on me because I had dealt my blows upon the Baronet! And, if you can, in the annals of malignity and cowardice, find any thing to equal this, I beg you to refer me to the page.

I beg you to bear in mind that this was the root of all the evil. Of both these law-suits, of some most furious assaults upon the Baronet; of some not less furious upon the *Rump*; and I venture to anticipate *other consequences* of a vast deal more importance to more than one of the parties. The branches which have come from this root have already extended pretty widely, and yet I fancy that we are not got yet nearly to the extremities.—Amongst the good consequences will be the total extinction of

the *Rump*: and I confess to you that I think that worth a great deal.

Gentlemen, Mr. SCARLETT said, upon the trial, that I endeavoured, by the means of *shuffling* and *cowardice*, to get out of the responsibility. I asserted then, as I repeat here, that I was *not the defendant*; but, at the same time, there was no attempt made to deprive the plaintiff of a defendant. On the contrary there was my Son, who was writer as well as publisher, and who, of course, admitted by his own oath the full extent of responsibility. There could be no danger that I could save myself from that to which he would not be exposed; and who but a monster can believe, or pretend to believe, that I wished to escape from pecuniary difficulties by imposing them upon him? The thing is ridiculous as well as monstrous.

I have truly stated, before, my reasons for declining to go into a justification in the trial of this action. But suppose it to have been a mere *whim*; or a mere desire to *put the thing off*, on account of the Jury or any thing else; pray, have not I as good a right to indulge myself in this way as Sir Francis Burdett has?

He takes three terms to endeavour to set aside a trial in which he has been the loser, after, by the bye, having had an opportunity to defend himself in person. And has any body yet imputed *shuffling* or *cowardice* to him? He has availed himself of his power to employ lawyers, in order to change the scene of trial or to obtain time, and who calls him a *shuffler* or a *coward* on this account. Nor was it the least amusing part of the proceedings of the day to hear him larded with compliments from the same pair of lips out of which every species of abuse came foaming upon me. I never said during these three terms that there was a shuffle or a juggle going on; I never cried out coward, and said that it was a mere trick to deny the letter in one county that was acknowledged in another county. There was the letter; it was written by Sir Francis; it was sent to Brooks to be published; Brooks published it; Sir Francis owned it, and well he might, for it was the best production of his that I ever saw. The matter was clear all through. He did not attend the publication in London; but he sent it to London; he was in Leicestershire when he wrote it;

he must have put it out of his hand in Leicestershire; and what signifies it whether it was tried in Leicestershire or London? Yet, do I call it shuffling; do I call it cowardice in him to make use of his *purse* (in the employment of lawyers and attorneys I mean) to endeavour to put off the evil hour? Certainly I do not. A man is to take every advantage in such a case, which is offered to him by the forms and delays of the law. But then what sort of person is this? He is not to be attacked by the pen. Vengeance of all sorts is to be resorted to in the repelling of such attacks. Private letters are to be brought forth and read and garbled; he is to be permitted to publish his own letters in answer to private letters, and those answers are to contain misinterpretations of the letters which they profess to answer; he is to send forth through the *Rump*, such publications as the Leicestershire letter; he is to have all the credit of great boldness and resolution and devotion to the country; he is to be canonized while yet alive as a martyr in the cause of freedom; he is to have three terms, and half a dozen lawyers, for the purpose of endeavouring to set aside

a verdict, the evident tendency of which is, to send him to a prison; and after all this, he is to sit and receive the extreme unction of flattery from the very same mouth, which is the very next moment employed in vomiting forth upon me the charge of shuffling and cowardice, because I endeavour to shew that my Son, instead of myself, is the *proper defendant* in an action for damages! Why this person is by far the most sacred that I have ever heard of. The King is nothing to compare to him. The King can do no wrong, to be sure. One person, and one only, has contended that the King can commit no act of immorality or of folly; and really to this length the flatterers of the Baronet would seem to carry his privileges. Even what I am now writing will be called "*an attack upon Sir Francis Burdett*;" though it is absolutely necessary as an answer to the stupid imputations of his eulogist. There is no length to which this wretched *Rump* do not seem disposed to carry their flatteries with regard to this gentleman, of which we shall see a further proof by and by.

Not only is this sacred per-

sonage to be allowed, without imputation of blame, to avail himself of all the advantages which the delays of the law afford him; but he is, in the meanwhile, not to have a word dropped, if he keep aloof from the scene of action, and remain as quiet as a mouse, while *Major Cartwright*, who is placed in exactly the same state of peril, boldly and fearlessly puts himself forward with more activity and energy than ever. What a contrast might have been drawn here during the last six months! How often might I, if I had been so disposed, have dwelt upon this contrast! How clearly might I have shewn, that my former "*attacks*," as they are childishly called, were neither more nor less than the historical statements correct in substance, and only a little exaggerated in the colouring! Yet, during those six months, I have not alluded even to the tranquil state of Sir Francis, or to his absence from the scenes of action. I have seen, as well as other people, the great difference between his conduct and that of Major Cartwright; but not a syllable have I, in print, said upon the subject. If retirement and silence;

if the delays of the law; if any or if all of these could preserve him from a prison, he had a right to avail himself of them; but his eulogists; and those who reciprocate countenance and support with him, are not, because I endeavour to throw the burthen of an action upon the real defendant, and thereby to obtain the best means of causing justice to be done to all the parties; his eulogists and supporters, who bring forth my private letters in vengeance for my pretended "*attacks*" upon him; these people are not, upon such grounds, to accuse me of *shuffling* and *cowardice*, without my bringing forth his conduct in illustration of my arguments in defence against the imputation.

But, since these "*attacks*" have been so much talked of; and as they are now put forward again as a justification for the ransacking of a man's private letters written *ten years before*; since this is the case, since this stalking-horse has been again brought forward in order to hide all the baseness of the transactions at the Westminster Election; since the *Rump*, *Cleary*, *Weight*, and *Jackson*, are all to be placed

behind this stalking-horse, let us, gentlemen, see a little what those terrible "*attacks*" were, and enquire whether they were well or ill founded. I say that the *manner* of them was more harsh than I, upon reflection and with time to cool, could wish. I am ready to say, and I have very often said this same thing, and to repeat it as often as may be necessary. Mr. *Scarlett* said, in his reply, that I expressed my *sorrow* for these "*attacks*," and begged *pardon* of the Baronet. I contradicted him at the moment. I told him that what he was stating was not true: What I did say, gentlemen, was this: that the *attacks*, as they had been called, upon Sir Francis Burdett, were things which ought to have been forgotten as soon as possible; that they ought to have been obliterated from the memory, and that, for my own part, I had by no means felt a desire to renew them; that they would have been forgotten long ago, had it not been for the workings of a little, dirty, meddling mischievous crew, who sought a gratification of their own base passions in keeping them alive; and that I thought, after all, that the Baronet, hav-

ing also time to reflect, was a man with a mind too honourable not to reprobate the acts of treachery of which he had seen such an ample exhibition.

This is as nearly as possible what I said; yet the delicacy of Mr. *Scarlett's* mind could suggest the imputation of *cowardice* to be applied even to this instance of my candour and liberality; though it must have been manifest to every man that I had been actuated by no motive other than that of wishing to do nothing that could by possibility tend, under his present peculiar circumstances, to deprive him of any portion of public feeling which might exist in his favour. However, since these pretended and much-talked of "*attacks*" are again brought forward as the means of annoyance to me, I am imperiously called upon again to advert to those "*attacks*," and to inquire whether they were in the main just or unjust.

Now, gentlemen, observe these "*attacks*" were made [during two periods; the first between May 1817 and May 1818. This set of "*attacks*" were founded on the *public conduct* of Sir Francis. The second set of

"attacks" began after May 1818, and ended in the summer of 1819. This last set of "attacks" took place, you will observe, after the reading of my letter upon the hustings; after *Cleary* had ridden upon the white charger; after the Baronet had given his full countenance to that transaction by saying that *Cleary* was not blameable, and by announcing, at a public meeting, that a facsimile of the letter would be published; and also after Sir Francis had caused to be published (first having had it shewn in manuscript at Brooks's) a private letter from him to me, relating to money which I owed him; after he had caused to be published this answer (no copy of which I ever received from him); after he had caused to be published this, together with my private letter to him relating to the same debt, and which private letter to him contained a frank statement of the whole of my affairs: it was *after* all this that the second set of attacks began. Was it possible for them to be much too harsh? If the Lord Chief Justice was sound in his doctrine when he said, upon the trial with *Cleary*, that the breach of private confi-

dence in *that* case, justified very severe terms of reprobation; if such was the opinion gravely delivered by a Judge in his charge, what bounds, I pray you, were to be set to the terms in which I was to "attack" Sir Francis Burdett, after that conduct of his of which I have just given you a description?

Therefore, gentlemen, electors of Westminster, who suffer yourselves to be sported with by a *Rump* Committee, you are, in estimating those things which are called "attacks" upon Sir Francis Burdett, to leave wholly out of the question all the "attacks" which have taken place since the election of 1818; for, whatever they have been, they have been fully merited. And when did these "attacks" cease? And under what circumstances have they been wholly discontinued? Gentlemen, pray attend to these questions. The "attacks" ceased the moment I set eyes on his letter to the electors of Westminster; for which letter he has since been, as I was very sure he would be, brought into great peril. From that hour to this have I made any "attack" upon Sir Francis Burdett? Twice, I think it is, he has been named by me, in the

way of defence of myself against what I deemed an "*attack*" on his part; or on the part of the meddling fools who seem to aim at his destruction; but have I attacked him? Have I said a syllable about his unaccountable absence and silence during the last six most interesting months? Nay, was not the one single occasion when he did step forward in Parliament, eagerly caught at by me as the ground of bestowing the highest praise on his conduct; and did I not, by the republishing of his speech on that occasion, manifestly not only not to my own pecuniary advantage, and manifestly also to my loss, do as much as in me lay to insure to him every particle of praise that was his due? Did this conduct bespeak rancour, malignity, enmity, revenge, as existing in my breast; or did it bespeak just the contrary of all these?

It is to the *first* set of "*attacks*," therefore, that I now request you to turn your attention for a few minutes; and, while I do not pretend that cool reflection would justify them as to their *manner*, to the utmost extent, I think I shall be able to produce to you proof unde-

niable of the justice of the *matter* of those "*attacks*;" I think that what has happened in your own city not many days ago, has made good to the very letter, the *matter* of those "*attacks*."

Those attacks embraced two points: *first*, the making use of a junto called the *Rump*, for insuring to himself and an underling of his own choosing, seats for the City of Westminster; and also for the purpose of excluding from those seats every man not devoted to him, and not willing to be his underling, however great the industry and talent of such man. If you want any proof of the truth of these allegations; if you want any thing more in this way than that which has passed before your eyes, and which is perceived by every man in the nation, it would be waste of time to attempt to give it you. As to this point, the matter is settled by the evidence of facts.

The *second* point was, to express the whole in two short propositions, "that the Baronet was a man of *talk* and not of *do*; that he called upon the people to support him, and that when the people *stirred* he would not move."

Now, Gentlemen, I will not attempt to refer you to the *past*. I mean to nothing that has not passed within this *month*. I will not waste your time by carrying you back to 1817, or even to the languor and lassitude and still-life of the last summer. I will confine myself to the space of one single month; and if you do not find within that space proofs in ample justification of my "*attacks*," in the capacity of *historian*, you will be reduced to the absolute necessity of acknowledging me to be a *prophet*. To which latter character, however, I have not the impiety to aspire.

Now, then, observe, her Majesty, who had triumphed over her enemies, was the object of universal congratulation on the part of the people. Numerous addresses were instantly prepared and voted. More than a *hundred and fifty* had, I believe, been actually presented; some of them from two hundred miles distance; some even from *Scotland*. The city of London had met, had gone up and addressed her Majesty. The city of Westminster did not stir! The borough of Southwark had met and addressed her Majesty. Even the *parishes* in Westminster itself had met or were meet-

ing, and one of your Members had presided at one of those meetings, but the *City itself* did not stir! This City that used to take the lead in every good thing; this great, populous and really public-spirited City remained dumb as a wool-pack, while even the very villages in Somersetshire and Cornwall were sending up addresses to the Queen! Talk of supporting her Majesty, indeed! What support would that persecuted and gallant lady have received from the people of England, towards whom she so graciously expresses her boundless gratitude, if the people of England had, upon this important occasion, *waited for the example of Westminster!*

Oh! Gentlemen, see what it is to have suffered yourselves to be subjected to the government of a *Rump*! Thank me for the endeavours I am now making to rescue you from this state of indescribable abasement. *Your* hearts were good. You felt for her Majesty. You, round your fire-sides, congratulated the Queen. But, having submitted yourselves to the government of a *Rump*; that Rump being notoriously the mere instrument of one man; that man not choos-

ing to step forward; there you stood a mark for the finger of scorn to the whole kingdom! At last, some spirited tradesmen, resolved not to share in meriting this scorn, signed a requisition, took it to the High Bailiff, and called a meeting, the result of which was, an Address to her Majesty, and a Petition to the King.

Let us now see, then, what passed at this Meeting. Sir Francis Burdett came to it. He was compelled to come. It was absolute and instant perdition not to come. Having come, he was compelled to speak. And now we come to the main point, as to which I shall now produce proof, that in those things stigmatized as "*attacks*," I was either a correct *historian* or a *prophet*.

Bear in mind, if you please, that the "*attacks*" stated Sir Francis Burdett to be "a man of TALK and not of DO." Do you remember in the course of those "*attacks*," these words: "*many talks* about impeaching Castlereagh, but no *impeachment*?" You must remember, I think, these very words. Now, then, observe, during his speech at this Meeting Sir Francis said, "all that had transpired upon

"the subject, served to prove that his Majesty's Ministers ought to be hanged [loud plaudits]." In another part of his speech he said, that even "if unwilling agents in the transaction, no ministers since the revolution, had done any thing more loudly calling for *impeachment* [applause]."

Thus far Sir Francis. Next came Mr. Hobhouse, who spoke thus. "He would only say, therefore, that unless the *people of England* came forward to demand, not only the dismissal, but the *impeachment*; not only the *impeachment*, but the *punishment* of those who had heaped such multifarious evils upon them, the work would be but half done [loud cheers]. Let not the people deceive themselves; let them not believe, that if they waited till Parliament meet, two months hence, some means would not be found of *tricking the people* out of their just demands for the *punishment* of those whom the united voice of the people of England pronounced to be the only *malefactors*."

Now, Gentlemen, Electors of Westminster, was not this pretty bold talk? Let us now look at

the *do*. It appears that some of the electors present thought that this talk *meant something*! They appear to have thought that when men talked of *impeaching* and *hanging*, that they meant, at least, to do something in the way of impeaching; and, thus thinking, some of them stepped on one side and drew up a resolution, which, according to the report in the Morning Chronicle, was in the following words:

"That this Meeting has heard
"with *peculiar satisfaction*,
"the declarations of Sir Francis
"Burdett, Bart. and John Cam-
"Hobhouse, Esq. of the *pro-*
"*priety* and *necessity* of *im-*
"*peaching* his Majesty's Minis-
"ters, for their unconstitutional
"and illegal proceedings against
"the Queen, and also for the
"atrocious violation of the con-
"stitutional rights of the sub-
"ject, which has long charac-
"terised their counsels and
"measures; and that this Meet-
"ing, feeling the greatest con-
"fidence in the *zeal, persever-*
"*ance, industry, and talents* of
"their Representatives, do here-
"by request that Sir Francis
"Burdett, Bart. and John Cam-
"Hobhouse, Esq. will under-
"take, in the name and on be-
"half of the people of Eng-
"land, to move and conduct an
"impeachment of the Ministers
"of the Crown, and that the
"other Members of Parliament
"now present be requested to
"support the same."

Could any thing in this world be more proper than this? What could be so natural; what so proper? And, as one would have thought, what so gratifying to these two high spirited members of Parliament? The Resolution was, it appears, moved by Mr. BENBOW, of the Strand. The report says, as you will see, that he afterwards *withdrew* it. He asserts, most positively, that he did not; and that the members of the *Rump*, who were in and about the hustings, made a hubbub and confusion. However, I shall take the report and lay it before you, just as I find it given in the Morning Chronicle; and I am persuaded that you will find in it the most satisfactory proof, that, in my pretended "*attacks*," I was the most correct of all *historians*, or one of the truest of all the *prophets* that ever lived in the world.

"Sir F. BURDETT trusted that
"the Meeting would not adopt
"such a Resolution as this upon
"the spur of the moment. The
"*propriety* of impeaching his
"Majesty's Ministers was one
"thing; the *necessity* of doing
"so was another. There was
"another consideration of great
"importance, which the persons
"with whom this Resolution
"had originated appeared to

" have overlooked; namely, the
 " propriety of doing the thing
 " effectually. They had not
 " considered the means of the
 " present Meeting to carry the
 " Resolution into effect, or the
 " means and powers of the per-
 " sons who were instructed to
 " propose such a measure. This
 " was not the time and place
 " for such a Resolution. He
 " supposed no man would doubt
 " his (Sir F. Burdett's) readi-
 " ness to lend all his assistance
 " to obtain justice for the coun-
 " try, and an inquiry into that
 " long course of mal-adminis-
 " tration under which the peo-
 " ple had laboured. He trust-
 " ed the people of Westminster
 " would give him credit for be-
 " ing at all times ready to use
 " his best exertions in the pub-
 " lic cause, and, at the same
 " time, he felt persuaded that
 " they would not adopt a Reso-
 " lution of this kind at such a
 " time without reflection, and
 " call upon him to undertake a
 " great and important measure,
 " which it would be utterly out
 " of his power to carry into ef-
 " fect.

" Mr. BENBOW said, he had
 " not been convinced by the ar-
 " guments of the Honourable
 " Baronet, and that he should
 " still feel it his duty to press
 " his motion. The Honourable
 " Baronet had talked of the
 " inadequacy of their means
 " and forces, but surely they
 " had force enough to make the
 " attempt; they had at least
 " force enough to endeavour to
 " chain the iron hand of despo-
 " tism, and let the result be
 " what it might, it would teach

" Ministers an important les-
 " son.

" Mr. HOBHOUSE said, there
 " could be no doubt of his Ho-
 " nourable Colleague's desire to
 " chain the iron of despotism,
 " and to co-operate cordially in
 " any measure which could lead
 " to such a result; but the
 " question now was, whether
 " the Resolution which had
 " been proposed was calculated
 " to effect the object it had in
 " view? If they thought the pas-
 " sing of such a Resolution was
 " the best way of effecting that
 " object, undoubtedly he should
 " feel it his duty to be bound by
 " their decision, and to endea-
 " vour, as far as he was able,
 " to give effect to it. They had
 " elected him as their servant,
 " and as their servant he consi-
 " dered himself bound to obey
 " their instructions. At the
 " same time he begged them to
 " consider whether the passing
 " of this Resolution was likely
 " to lead to the object which
 " they had in view. He en-
 " tirely concurred with his Ho-
 " nourable Colleague, that in
 " the present state of Parlia-
 " ment, the punishment of Mi-
 " nisters was not likely to be
 " effected in this way. They
 " would recollect that in the
 " last Session of Parliament,
 " when a motion was made for
 " an inquiry into the state of
 " the nation, only 170 Members
 " of that Parliament voted even
 " for an inquiry into the griev-
 " ances of the people. That same
 " Parliament had supported the
 " present Ministers throughout
 " the whole of the late nefar-
 " ious proceedings. In an as-

“semble so constituted, there
 “could be little hope that any
 “endeavour on the part of his
 “Honourable Colleague and
 “himself to bring Ministers to
 “justice, would be attended
 “with success.”

“Mr. BENBOW withdrew his
 motion.”

“Sir F. BURDETT was glad
 “the motion had been with-
 “drawn, for had they passed
 “such a Resolution under such
 “circumstances, it would not
 “only have been utterly in-
 “effectual, but in every point
 “of view *unadvised* and *child-*
 “*ish*. If the *people of England*,
 “however, felt as the Electors
 “of Westminster did on this
 “subject, and they chose to
 “petition Parliament to im-
 “peach Ministers, that mode of
 “proceeding might by possi-
 “bility have some *practical*
 “effect, but a mere Resolution
 “passed at a Public Meeting,
 “however respectable, convened
 “for another purpose, would
 “not only be very *inexpedient*
 “and *ineffectual*, but *childish*,
 “and liable to *ridicule*.”

Talk of *shuffling*, Gentlemen!
 Did the world ever before see
shuffling like this? “Like mas-
 ter like man” is an old saying;
 and never was more apt than
 upon the present occasion. Not
 being willing to imitate, in the
 most distant degree, the *Rump*
 and their associates, I will not
 even mention what was alleged
 in the *side talk* upon the hust-
 ings, as one of the reasons for

objecting to this resolution; but
 it is quite evident that here is no
 good reason given, and that the
 whole is a piece of *shuffling*,
 which is, perhaps, without a
 parallel even in the records of
 the *Rump*.

I am unwilling to detain you a
 moment longer upon such a sub-
 ject; but do pray look at the Ba-
 ronet's *distinction* between the
propriety and the *necessity* of
 impeaching the Ministers. Ne-
 cessity means something that is
needful, and propriety, in this
 case, means *fitness*. Now, could
 it be *needful* to impeach the
 Ministers, and yet not *fit to do*
it? Can that which is necessary
 be improper, or can that which
 is *proper*, in such a case, be *un-*
necessary? However, not to
 waste our time upon the split-
 ting of hairs, could it be either
 unnecessary or improper to im-
 peach men, who, according to
 the Baronet, “ought to be hang-
 “ed”? If so we must conclude,
 taking the speeches of both
 members together, that the way
 to go to work, according to
 them, was, to *hang the Minis-*
ters first and impeach them
afterwards!

Here we hear Sir Francis
 again calling upon the “*people*
 of England” to come forward!

This is just the old language. This is precisely what I complained of in my first set of "attacks;" but here is the flagrant inconsistency of calling upon the people of England to come forward to demand impeachment, while there are several thousands of those people standing before him, demanding that very impeachment which Mr. Hobhouse had only five minutes before called upon them to demand; here is the monstrous inconsistency of thus calling upon the people of England to come forward with this demand, and when they instantly make the demand, calling that demand, "*inexpedient, ineffectual, childish and ridiculous*"!

There! I surely need not say another word! Thus it has been for several years, and thus it will be, while this great City shall suffer itself to be under the guidance of that miserable junto called the *Rump*, who have, as to all practical purposes, rendered Westminster as much a rotten borough, as Gatton or Old Sarum. The trial about *Wright* is a thing of no consequence in itself; but, it is of importance as it serves to discover, and lay bare to your

view the wheels and pegs and springs and wires by which a set of intrigues are constantly carrying on to render your right of election in effect a nullity, and to prevent this great and public spirited City from assisting in the smallest degree in the restoration of national freedom and prosperity.

Look, too, at the conduct of the *Rump* upon this occasion. Observe how these men made it an occasion for offering the incense of flattery to their idol; and look at the stupid and impudent trash which Sir Francis Burdett called "*the very flattering manner in which the worthy gentleman had introduced his name.*" This flattering affair was, as is reported in the Chronicle, in the following words. "He (Mr. Fish) could not forbear from advertising to the circumstances in which their long tried friend Sir F. Burdett was placed for his active and ardent exertions in defence of liberty and humanity. These circumstances were indeed such, that he was much afraid that if the people did not stand forward in due time, an attempt would be made to act upon a verdict which never could have been obtained but through the mal-administration of public justice (applause), and that one of the most enlightened patriots

"England ever knew might be subjected to a severe visitation (cries of "no, no"). That Ministers would be happy to place such a man as Sir Francis Burdett *hors de combat*, there could not be the slightest doubt. Such men must be afraid of truth, or any one likely to speak it with firmness, especially at the present crisis, when the public mind was so strongly excited, and when so much public spirit prevailed throughout the country. But he hoped and trusted that *that spirit which had saved the Queen* from the persecution of those Ministers, would also be exerted to *arrest their vindictive purpose with regard to Sir Francis Burdett.*"

This was a flattering manner, was it! The folly of this man, is to be equalled by nothing but his impudence. What! are *all the people* to come out, then, upon this occasion! And what are they to *do*? Are they to go to the Court of King's Bench and order the Judges not to pass their sentence? was their ever such impudence! such bloated, such over-grown, such prodigious folly! This man pretends to be alarmed, lest Sir Francis Burdett should be sent to prison. Grant that he really wishes that he should not be so sent: but, look, then, at the presumptuous stupidity of the man, or,

rather, at his unparalleled impudence! He knows, or he ought to know, that Sir Francis is wholly and entirely in the hands of the Judges. He ought to know that a new trial has been refused, and that the defendant is to be brought up for judgment. In this state of things what does he do? Why, at a public meeting, surrounded by thousands of persons, call upon the *people to come forward, and arrest* what he calls the vindictive purpose of the Ministers; while, and in the very same breath, he accuses of *mal-administration of public justice*; those very judges at whose mercy he must know, unless he be an idiot, as well as a "*worthy gentleman*," Sir Francis Burdett is now placed. Of all topics in the world this topic ought to have been most carefully avoided upon such an occasion, and under such circumstances; and, if it had been introduced at all, could it have been introduced in such a manner by any human being that did not belong to the little lick-spittle, and, at the same time, pert and impertinent crew, called the *Rump*, who, at the very moment that they are calling upon *the whole nation* to

come forward and *arrest* the proceedings against Sir Francis Burdett for *libel*, are bawling out against *me as a libeller of him*, and are putting in motion all their wheels and wires in order to insure *my* destruction ! This *Rump* have seen scores of public-spirited men sent to the dungeons. They have seen Mr. Knight, Mr. Dewhurst, shut up in jail for two years. They have seen Sir Charles Wolllesley sent to jail. They have seen Mr. Harrison sent to jail for three years and a half. They have seen Mr. Hunt sent to jail for two years and a half. They have seen one man in Cheshire sent to jail for four years and a half for publishing seditious libels. Not a word of commiseration from the *Rump* towards any of those persons. Nay, at a meeting where Mr. Hobhouse was one of the leaders, a toast to the health of these public spirited sufferers *was rejected* ! And, after all this, this *Rump* has the impudence to call upon the whole of the people of England to come and rescue by force their idol, who has also been convicted of a seditious libel ! All England is to rise, because Sir Francis Burdett is likely to share in the

fate of men, beyond all measure more public spirited and useful than himself, and beyond all measure less indulged during the proceedings against them. Many of the persons above mentioned were not only held to bail, but were committed to *prison long before they were brought to trial. From a prison they were brought into court to defend themselves* ! Has this been the fate of Sir Francis ? No ! He has been allowed three terms to endeavour to obviate a sentence. Four Judges have sat listening, first and last, for *fifteen days*, to the endeavours of his advocates to prove grounds for a new trial. Patience like this has very rarely been shewn in any court. It has been without a parallel, and certainly it has reflected great honour upon those Judges. At last they come to a solemn determination that he shall not have the new trial. And what then ? Why, the Attorney-General gives him the further indulgence of not being called up to receive judgment *until the next term* ! And, with all these striking facts staring him in the face ; this insolent and despicable *Rump*, who have never said a word about the imprisonment of

Mr. Hunt, Mr. Harrison, Sir Charles Wolseley, or about the terrible sentence on the poor man at Chester; this impudent *Rump*, who so unfeelingly rejected a toast to the health of these and numerous other sufferers, have now the coxcomical effrontery to call upon *all England* to come forward and "*arrest*" the arm of the law with regard to Sir F. Burdett; while I beg you to bear it in mind, they are making use of all their underhand malignant means of annoying and injuring me for having made what they call "*attacks*" on this very man whom all England is to rise and rescue!

Jackson, while he was shewing my manuscripts to the *Rump*, was at the same time writing to congratulate me that I had tickled the *Rump*. Tickling is not enough now. It requires boiling or broiling; one of which operations, I think, I have now performed on it; and, therefore, for the present, I leave it; reserving to myself, however, the privilege of returning to the cookery again and again, if it be necessary, until it shall have wasted in the water, or dried over the fire to a chip.

I now come to a part of Mr. *Scarlett's* attacks, which was of a very singular nature indeed, namely, that *I put my children forward*, that I put my *infant* son forward, in order to *shield myself*! This is wholly false, because that which was stated by my sons was all perfectly true. My eldest son not only caused the publication, but was the writer. But, what precious nonsense is this about putting my sons forward to shelter myself! What abominable nonsense is it! In the first place, this *infant child* was, when he first took possession of the publication, *only* eighteen years old; and the *infant* wanted (at that time) almost an inch and three quarters of being six feet high. In the next place, there was no *shelter* wanted upon this occasion; for there was this same son, now twenty-two years old, avowing himself to be the proper defendant. But, even suppose it had been a criminal information by the Attorney-General; would it have been *shuffling* and *cowardice* in me, as *Scarlett* said it was, for my son to assume the responsibility? If it would have been such in me, what must be the judgment of the public upon persons con-

nected with what has been as the victim, if a victim there
 called the *respectable* part of must be, in the stead of his
 the press? I have sent to the father. And what did the At-
 Stamp-office to see how this torney-General do? Why, he
 matter stands. But first let me suffered even the son to go
 observe, that Mr. White, of the unprosecuted, and yet this *Scar-*
 Independent Whig, being in *lett* is to take advantage of his
 Dorchester jail in 1811, and dung-hill, and call me a *shuffler*
 continuing to be the proprietor and a *coward*, because my son
 of his paper, had an ex-officio comes forward and avows that
 information laid against him for it was he who wrote and pub-
 a libel published in that paper. lished that, with the writing of
 He brought forward *his son* which his father is charged, and
 (who was an *infant* also, I be- with the publishing of which he
 lieve,) to swear that *he had* is also charged, though this fa-
inserted the article without his ther was in America while the
father's knowledge. And what other was only at Dorchester!
 did the jury do upon that occa- But, a word or two of the re-
 sion? Why, they acquitted Mr. spectable part of the press. Mr.
 White, who was never accused *Daniel Stewart* is one of the pro-
 of *shuffling* and *cowardice* be- prietors of the Courier. Not long
 cause he put forward his son; back, his name and that of Mr.
 or, rather, because that son *Street* stood at the Stamp
 came forward to offer up him- Office; but *now* the names of
 self as the real author, and Mr. *Street* and Mr. *Mudford*,
 stand at the Stamp Office; and

if a libel be published in the Courier, Mr. Stewart evades *personal responsibility*. Do I call Mr. Stewart a *shuffler* and a *coward* for this? No; but then am I a *shuffler* and a *coward* because I shelter myself from personal responsibility? This is not the case, for there is no personal responsibility in the question with regard to me; but even if there were such, I ask you, Gentlemen, is not this *Scarlett* an abusive calumniator?

The persons whose names stand at the Stamp Office as responsible proprietors of the *Times newspaper*, are TWO LADIES, whose names it is unnecessary to mention particularly. They are, doubtless, the sisters of Mr. *Walter*; they own a share of that very valuable property; and the brother and sisters have a right, agreeably to the law, to take into view all the circumstances of their situation, and of public matters; and to so act as shall expose themselves, all viewed

together, to the smallest chance of danger. I do not blame Mr. *Walter*; but could any human being blame me for availing myself of any degree of protection to be obtained through the means of my son becoming the proprietor of the publication instead of myself? Shall not my son feel as strong a disposition to protect his father, as Mr. *Walter's* sisters feel to protect their brother? Mr. *Scarlett's* experience may have produced in his mind, astonishment that a son should prefer going to prison himself, to the seeing of his father go to prison; but, I trust that there are very few sons of Englishmen, who would not, if necessary, put their own persons in such a case in place of that of their father. This *Scarlett* called me *cruel*, for what he called putting forward my son in this way! This man (who certainly cannot have the happiness to be a father himself), does not imagine, then, I suppose, that, if a sentence were

passed to cut off a male leg in my family, either of my sons would insist that it should not be a leg of their father. He may look upon such a thing as impossible; but I should be a most unhappy wretch, if I were not convinced that it would be the fact.

However, this is all waste of words. It is such nonsense; it is so stupid to talk of *shuffling* and *cowardice* in such a case; that every man must say that my sons would be the most unnatural of children were they not ready and willing, and even were they not to insist upon doing that which this frothy man imputes it as a crime to me in having suffered them to do. What! It was so evident, I suppose, that I had found such *faithful* agents in others, that it was brutal of me to think of exposing my own "*infants*," six feet high! Such faithful creatures had always been about me; *Wright* and *Jackson*, in bringing out my private

letters, had given such undeniable proofs, that I stood in no need of the agency of my own "*infants*," that I ought to have suffered these latter to walk about, and grow up as straight as a rush without interrupting their tranquillity by making them the depositaries of my confidence! It was so "*cruel*" to put responsibility upon these little darlings; and so monstrously unjust and wicked to take my affairs out of the hands, my secrets out of the bosoms of that matchless pair, *Wright* and *Jackson*!

One of the libels, as they are called, was a letter to my son James at New York. This letter begins with the words, "*my dear little James*." This was fine food for the wit of Mr. Scarlett, who heaped upon "*my dear little James*" at a very great rate. He called him a young libeller; and added, that he wondered that I had not put my *wife* forward, too. Men, under certain cir-

cumstances, should say little about *wives*, unless very loudly called for; and that *Mr. Scarlett* would have found if I had had to reply to him instead of his having to reply to me. But, as to "*my dear little James*," it is curious enough that I should, when I came home from the Court, find a letter from him, dated at New York on the 7th November, and containing the following passage: "Your answer to the Attorney-General's opening speech has been re-published here; and every body says that *Mr. Brougham* ought to have read it to the Lords instead of the speech that he made in the opening of the Queen's defence. The answer to the Solicitor-General is also published. I got the bundle of placards and handbills by Captain Peck; and have distributed them in every direction as far as they would go. Except the Consul and his tribe, every one

" here is in favour of the Queen, and they are actually preparing an Address, as I understand, at Philadelphia." If it were not to shew too much respect to *Mr. Scarlett*, I would treat him to a twopenny post letter, inclosing him this letter of "*my dear little James*," who, notwithstanding *Mr. Scarlett's* miserable wit, has in this one single instance performed that which amounts to a greater quantity of merit, than *Mr. Scarlett* ever possessed, or ever will possess, to the end of his life. My opinion is, too, that "*my dear little James*" can, at the age of seventeen, write a great deal better than *Mr. Scarlett* can, or than he ever will. "*My dear little James*" has done more in the cause of her Majesty, than all her lawyers put together; and he has done this, too, without any fee.

The truth is, that *Mr. Scarlett* was labouring for several purposes: first to triumph over *Mr. Brougham*; second, he

was, as he thought, labouring for his *party*; third, he was labouring for his *patron*; fourth, and last, though not least, in his estimation, he was labouring for a *post*, which, out of delicacy, shall be nameless. In all these respects he was labouring in vain; and as to his prospects of *getting me into a prison*, they are certainly illusory. Does he think that he has established a principle which will run through printer, publisher, and every body else till it comes to the writer? He is very much deceived if he does think this; and, if I be a person whom he wishes to *get rid of*; if he have set his heart upon that, break heart, for thy malignant wish will never be gratified!

Notwithstanding all that I and the public have seen upon this occasion; notwithstanding these consequences of my open and confiding disposition, that disposition is by no means changed in the smallest degree. I know that rather than act a

treacherous part towards me, or any one belonging to me, Mr. Benbow would suffer himself to be cut into a thousand pieces. In estimating the relative effects of a confiding and of a suspicious disposition, the good is in a prodigious degree on the side of the former; for, though it now and then produces annoyance and affliction, the latter is an ever gnawing worm that leaves you not a moment's peace and happiness during the whole course of your life. In looking over the list of the faithful and of the perfidious, in whom I have placed confidence, the *former* is twenty times more numerous than the latter; and, it is very singular, but not more singular than true, that those books and documents, which will now enable me to cover the *Rump* and their associates with confusion, were those rescued from the flames in Long Island, in consequence only of the extraordinary fidelity, zeal, and courage of my housekeeper,

to whom, in my absence, my books and papers were entrusted. She rushed into the room, which was in flames, and when no man was bold enough to enter it, and dragged out the trunk to the door, at the manifest risk of her life. I had given her particular charge about the trunk, and in her confusion she had forgotten it until it was nearly too late. Oh! let us not talk, then, about being *sick of the world*, because we now and then meet with ingratitude and perfidy! A thousand of such men as have come forward with my private letters would not weigh a feather in the scale against Mrs. CHURCHER. I have derived more pleasure from the grateful recollection of this one act of her's, than I ever can suffer pain from all the treachery and perfidy that ever has been or ever can be employed against me.

One word as to the trial, merely as a trial. I had not the vanity to suppose that I was ca-

pable of conducting a complicated trial. I am not such a coxcomb as to set myself up as a lawyer, knowing nothing of the profession; and also knowing it to be a profession which requires a life of study. I never was in a Court of Justice above five times in my life; and I trust that it will not be supposed that I went there now for the silly purpose of making a figure. I went because it was necessary that I should go to speak of the *Rump* and their associates in those terms which, perhaps it would not have been proper for a lawyer to speak. I accomplished fully the purpose had in view. I began well the good work of roasting this *Rump*; and in which work, you may depend on it, I never will cease till I have destroyed its pernicious influence in this great and public-spirited City.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your faithful friend,

WM. COEBETT.

PROPOSED DINNER.

I insert below the proposition about a dinner. In consequence of letters received from several gentlemen in the country, I have determined to put it off to some little time after New Year's Day, because, I find it would be inconvenient for them to come up to London in the Christmas week. Probably, therefore, it will be in the second or third week in January, due notice will be given of the precise day. Some persons appear to have imagined that I propose a sort of Meeting of *Delegates*. I assure them I mean no such a thing! I mean merely a Meeting of persons to dine together, for the purpose of discussing the propriety of sending forth a declaration of their views and wishes with regard to Reform. The subject has been a good deal *mistified*. I wish to see it shortly treated of in a declaration. And though I, by no means pretend to dictate or prescribe to the country, or to any part of it, I am one man, at least, and have a right to offer my opinions. If numbers join me in those opinions, the joint and deliberate expression of the opinions may do good; and, at any rate, it appears to me impossible that it should do harm.

TO THE REFORMERS.

COUNTRYMEN AND FRIENDS,

The time seems to be arrived for *us* to make to the nation an explicit, a solemn, and a formal *Declaration* of our views and intentions. It is impossible for any man in his senses to believe, that the present state of things can last long. Indeed the very supporters of corruption avow, that a *great change* of some description must speedily take place. But, while all agree, that there must be a *change*, very few are found ready to declare what it is that they expect, or, indeed, that they wish.

It is true, that *we*, the Reformers, have repeatedly expressed, by petitions, and by other means, what are our *wishes*. But, this expression, though sufficiently plain, has been buried under a mass of co-temporary matter, and our views have been disfigured by the misrepresentations of the agents of our malignant and powerful enemies. Besides, the statements in support of our claims, the several writings in which our principles and designs have been sent forth, lie scattered here and there, and are no

where embodied in one single piece of reasonable bulk. Many who are now *young men*, were *boys* four years ago, when our struggle first began to assume a really serious aspect. Such of us as have long been engaged in the struggle, are apt to imagine, that, because we clearly understand the nature of the cause, the whole nation must clearly understand it; which, though an error natural enough, is still an error.

For these reasons, and many others that might be stated, it appears to me, that we now ought to send forth a *Declaration* of the description above given; and, if any considerable number of you concur with me in opinion, the following is the means that I shall adopt for effecting that purpose.

Circumstances may arise to prevent what I now intend, but, at present, my intention is to invite all who may choose to join me, to *dine* at some convenient place in London, on, or some day before, *New Year's Day*.

It is my opinion, that from this meeting, a *Declaration* might, at *this time*, be sent forth with great advantage to the cause of Par-

liamentary Reform, which, indeed, is *the cause of the kingdom*. It is now clear to most men, and, I believe, to *all men*, that to change the Ministry without changing the nature of the Representation in the Commons' House, would produce *no possible good*. And, yet, is it not indescribable disgrace to this great country that this present Ministry should remain in power! Those, who, from their rank and talent, might be naturally looked towards as the successors of the Ministers, know, and, indeed, *acknowledge*, that they could not remain in power without the support of the *Reformers*; and yet, to have that support they affect to *fear* to adopt the means; they affect to fear, that the adoption of those means would be *dangerous to the whole fabric of the government*.

This, therefore, is the time for us to *appeal to the nation*; and to shew, as we easily can, that those *fears*, real or pretended, are not only wholly groundless, but that to reform the Parliament is the only means of preserving the fabrick.

Such is the object which I have in view; and such the mode in which I propose to

effect it. I by no means wish to put *myself forward* on this or on any occasion; but, when we *want a thing done*, the example of the American Farmers has taught me that, "*come boys!*" and not "*go boys!*" is the word.

If any Gentleman, in country or town, has any improvement to suggest, as to the manner of accomplishing the object, I shall be happy to attend to such suggestions. If the meeting take place, I shall hope to see at it many Gentlemen from the Country. We must all be anxious, that what we do, upon this great occasion, may be able in the manner as well as sound in the matter; and, therefore, it is desirable to draw together a mass of knowledge and talent worthy of the goodness of our cause.

If it were thought desirable to *circulate the Declaration widely*, a hundred thousand might be distributed for a sum which we could certainly raise for such a purpose. Perhaps,

however, the best way will be to publish it without any subscription, and to sell it *very cheap indeed* to persons who may be disposed to hand it about amongst their neighbours, especially in the country.

I shall be glad to receive communications upon the subject, *by post* (No. 269, Strand): but the *postage must be paid*; or, I shall be, as I already should be, exposed to enormous plunder.

WM. COBBETT.

COBBETT'S GRAMMAR.

Just Published, Price 2s. 6d.

The *fourth edition*, carefully corrected, and dedicated to her Majesty, the Queen, of this work, which, as its title expresses, is intended for the use of schools and of young persons in general, and more especially for the use of *Soldiers, Sailors, Apprentices, and Plough-Boys.*

Sold by W. BENBOW, 269, Strand.

Printed and Published by W. BENBOW, 269, Strand;

Price Sixpence Halfpenny in the Country.